

Amtd. dated October 20, 2005
Reply to Office action of July 20, 2005

Serial No. 09/613,083
Docket No. STL920000055
Firm No. 0054.0038

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner said that certain references could not be considered because they were not included with the IDS submitted on 9/23/04. (Final Office Action, pg. 2) During the phone interview on September 22, 2005, the Examiner acknowledged that the Patent Office had received the references because PAIR provides an "artifact sheet indicating an item has been filed which cannot be scanned", dated 9/23/04. This artifact sheet in PAIR identifies seven references that were filed, but not scanned. The Examiner said he would locate the seven cited references, review and such acknowledge review.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-24 as obvious over the "Description of the Related Art" of the Application ("Related Art") in view of Edberg (U.S. Patent No. 5,793,381).

Amended claims 1, 9, and 17 concern creating a string of Unicode characters stored in a memory of a computer, and require: creating a constant whose data type is a non-Unicode data type, wherein the constant specifies non-Unicode data to convert to Unicode; storing a string of non-Unicode characters in the constant which is stored in the memory of the computer; retrieving a specification of a code page in which the non-Unicode character string is encoded; translating the non-Unicode character string stored with the constant into a Unicode character string responsive to the specification of the code page; and storing the Unicode character string in the constant stored in the memory of the computer.

During the phone interview, the Examiner suggested changing "associating" the string with the constant to "storing" the string in the constant to distinguish over the cited art. Applicants made this requested changes. Applicants further submit the arguments made during the phone interview explaining the distinction of the claims over the cited art. Applicants further amended these claims in a manner not discussed to clarify that the created constant has a non-Unicode data type and to specify that the constant specifies non-Unicode data to convert to Unicode. The added requirement that the data type is non-Unicode is disclosed in claims 1, 9, and 17 in the filed Application. The added requirement that the constant specifies data to convert are disclosed on at least pgs. 16, 20-21.

Amdt. dated October 20, 2005
Reply to Office action of July 20, 2005

Serial No. 09/613,083
Docket No. STL920000055
Firm No. 0054.0038

The Examiner cited pg. 5, lines 10-28 of the Related Art of the Application ("Related Art") as teaching the claim requirement of associating a string of non-Unicode characters with a constant whose data type is Unicode, which is stored in the memory of the computer. (Final Office Action, pg. 4) Applicants traverse.

The cited pg. 5 mentions different representations of a character string in different character formats and shows how after Unicode translation, the same characters are represented by twelve bytes. Although the cited pg. 5 discusses Unicode translation, nowhere does this cited pg. 5 anywhere disclose or mention creating a constant, storing a string of non-Unicode characters in the constant, and translating the non-Unicode character string in the constant to Unicode. There is no mention in the cited pg. 5 of creating a constant to store the non-Unicode character being translated. Moreover, there is no teaching in the cited pg. 5 of a constant that specifies non-Unicode data to convert to Unicode. Instead, the cited pg. 5 discusses converting a character from one format, such as hexadecimal, to Unicode.

In the Response to Arguments, the Examiner found that the Related Art's discussion of translating a text string stored in memory is a constant. (Final Office Action, pg. 7) Applicants traverse. A string is not a constant as that term is understood in the art. The claims require that the non-Unicode characters are stored in a constant, which is something separate from the string itself. The cited Background discusses converting a non-Unicode string, but nowhere teaches or suggests first storing a string in a constant that specifies non-Unicode data to convert to Unicode and then performing the translation with respect to the non-Unicode data stored in the constant.

Further, the Examiner has not cited any art that teaches or suggests the claim requirement of translating a non-Unicode character string using a constant that specifies non-Unicode data to convert to Unicode. The Examiner cited col. 3, lines 57-61 and col. 4, lines 10-67 of Edberg. (Final Office Action, pg. 4)

The cited col. 3 mentions dividing a source string in a first character encoding into text elements, looking-up in a mapping table a conversion code associated with a second character encoding for each text element, and combining the conversion codes of the text elements to form

Amdt. dated October 20, 2005
Reply to Office action of July 20, 2005

Serial No. 09/613,083
Docket No. STL920000055
Firm No. 0054.0038

the target string. Nowhere does this cited col. 3 anywhere teach or suggest storing the non-Unicode character string in a constant and then translating the non-Unicode character string in the constant into a Unicode character string. There is no mention or teaching in the cited col. 3 of involving a constant in the translation, such that the constant specifies non-Unicode data to convert to Unicode, and then translating data stored in the constant. Instead, the cited col. 3 mentions determining a conversion code for text elements from a mapping table.

The cited col. 4 also mentions looking up target encodings in a mapping table for source target encodings. The code conversion system may include a fallback handler and a scanner table, such that the fallback handler provides codes when the lookup handler is unable to provide a code for one or more text elements, where the fallback handler codes are not exactly equivalent to the source text elements, but similar in appearance. The cited col. 4 further discussing scanning an input character having a character encoding, and each character of the input character string having a character class. The scanning system determines whether the input character of the input character string should be included within a current text element or whether the current text element should end a new text element begun.

Although the cited col. 4 discusses converting a source string to a conversion code by looking up conversion codes in a table or mapping, nowhere does the cited col. 4 anywhere teach or suggest that a constant specifies non-Unicode data to convert to Unicode, storing data in such a constant, and then translating the non-Unicode character string in the constant to Unicode.

There is no mention in the cited art of a constant specifying non-Unicode data to convert to Unicode, and then translating the non-Unicode data stored in the constant to Unicode.

Accordingly, amended claims 1, 9, and 17 are patentable over the cited art because the cited art does not teach or suggest all the claim requirements.

Claims 2-8, 10-16, and 18-24 are patentable over the cited art because they depend from one of claims 1, 9, and 17. Moreover, the following dependent claims provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art.

Amdt. dated October 20, 2005
Reply to Office action of July 20, 2005

Serial No. 09/613,083
Docket No. STL920000055
Firm No. 0054.0038

Amended claims 5, 13, and 21 depend from claims 1, 9, and 17 and further recite that the translation is performed by the computer according to a scope, wherein the specification of the code page applies to translate constants in a portion of a computer program identified by the scope.

Applicants amended these claims to clarify that the specification of the code page is applied to translate constants in a portion of a computer program identified by the scope. This clarifying language is disclosed on pg. 22 of the Application.

The Examiner cited pg. 5, lines 10-28 of the Related Art with respect to the pre-amended version of these claims. (Final Office action, pg. 5) Applicants traverse.

As discussed, the cited pg. 5 discusses translating a non-unicode character string to Unicode. Nowhere does the cited pg. 5 anywhere teach or suggest the use of a scope such that the specification of the code page applies to translate constants in a portion of a computer program identified by the scope. Further, nowhere does the cited pg. 5 anywhere teach or suggest applying a specification of a code page to constants in a portion of the computer program.

Accordingly, amended claims 5, 13, and 21 provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art because the additional requirements of these claims are not taught or suggested in the cited art.

Amended claims 6, 14, and 22 depend from claims 5, 13, and 21 and further require that the scope is global, the global scope specifying that the specification of the code page applies to translate constants in the entire computer program.

Applicants amended these claims to recite that the global scope specifies that the specification of the code page applies to translate constants in the entire computer program. The additional requirements of these claims are disclosed on at least page 22 of the Application.

The Examiner cited col. 2, lines 1-67, col. 3, lines 57-61, and col. 4, lines 10-67 of Edberg as teaching these claim requirements. (Final Office Action, pgs. 5 and 8-9) Applicants traverse.

Amdt. dated October 20, 2005
Reply to Office action of July 20, 2005

Serial No. 09/613,083
Docket No. STL920000055
Firm No. 0054.0038

The cited col. 2 of Edberg discusses conversion from Unicode characters to a specific language and the cited cols. 3-4 discuss a conversion process to convert a source string to a target string. Nowhere do the cited cols, 2, 3, and 4 anywhere teach or suggest a global scope that specifies that the specification of the code page applies to translate constants in the entire computer program. There is no mention in the cited art of a scope or other value indicating that the code page is supposed to apply to translate non-Unicode data in all constants in the computer program.

Further, although the cited Edberg discusses a mapping table to use to translate non-Unicode characters, nowhere does the cited Edberg teach or suggest a scope that specifies constants to which the code page is to apply.

Accordingly, amended claims 6, 14, and 22 provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art because the additional requirements of these claims are not taught or suggested in the cited art.

Amended claims 7, 15, and 23 depend from claims 5, 13, and 21 and further require that the scope is local, the local scope specifying that the specification of the code page applies to translate constants in a subsequent portion of the computer program.

Applicants amended these claims to recite that the local scope specifies that the specification of the code page applies to translate constants in a subsequent portion of the computer program. These added requirements are disclosed on at least pgs. 22 and 24-25.

The Examiner cited pg. 7, lines 1-17 of the Related Art with respect to the pre-amended form of these claims. (Final Office Action, pgs. 6 and 9) Applicants traverse.

The cited pg. 7 discusses a hexadecimal coding of the DBCS string and translation to Unicode and how the characters are represented. Nowhere in the cited pg. 7 is there any teaching or suggestion of a local scope that specifies that the specification of the code page applies to translate constants in a subsequent portion of the computer program.

Amdt. dated October 20, 2005
Reply to Office action of July 20, 2005

Serial No. 09/613,083
Docket No. STL920000055
Firm No. 0054.0038

Accordingly, amended claims 7, 15, and 23 provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art because the additional requirements of these claims are not taught or suggested in the cited art.

Amended claims 8, 16, and 24 depend from claims 5, 13, and 21 and further require that the scope is constant specific and that the constant specific scope specifies that the code page applies only to a specific constant.

These claims were amended to recite that the constant specific scope specifies that the specification of the code page applies only to a specific constant. These added requirements are disclosed on at least pgs. 22 and 26-27.

The Examiner cited pg. 5, lines 10-28 of the Related Art with respect to these claims. (Final Office Action, pgs. 6, 9) Applicants traverse.

The cited pg. 5 discusses converting a character string in one format, such as hexadecimal, to a Unicode format. Nowhere does the cited pg. 5 anywhere teach or suggest a constant specific scope that specifies that the code page applies only to a specific constant. Instead, the cited pg. 5 discusses translation of a character string.

Accordingly, claims 8, 16, and 24 provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art because the additional requirements of these claims are not taught or suggested in the cited art.

Conclusion

For the above reasons, Applicant submits that the pending claims 1-24 are in condition for allowance. Applicants have not added any claims. Nonetheless, should any additional fees be required, please charge Deposit Account No. 09-0460.

//
//
//
//
//
//
//
//

Amdt. dated October 20, 2005
Reply to Office action of July 20, 2005

Serial No. 09/613,083
Docket No. STL920000055
Firm No. 0054.0038

The attorney of record invites the Examiner to contact him at (310) 553-7977 if the Examiner believes such contact would advance the prosecution of the case.

Dated: October 20, 2005

By: 

David W. Victor
Registration No. 39,867

Please direct all correspondences to:

David Victor
Konrad Raynes & Victor, LLP
315 South Beverly Drive, Ste. 210
Beverly Hills, CA 90212
Tel: 310-553-7977
Fax: 310-556-7984